

1980 Emmitsburg Rd., Gettysburg, Pa. 17325, Tel: (706)461-3735

RICHARD NEWTON HILL, JR.

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

MAR 08 2007

Fax

To: Mr. Charles Freay

From: RICHARD N. HILL, JR.

Fax: 1-571-273-8300

Pages: 1

Phone: 1-571-272-4827

Date: Thursday, March 08, 2007

Re: My patent application 10/600701, Applicant: Richard Newton Hill, Jr., Filed: June 23, 2003, TC/A.U.: 3746, Examiner: Charles G Freay

☐ [X] Urgent ☒ [X] For Review ☐ [X] Please Comment

● Comments

Dear Chuck,

After thinking over our conversation of March 7, 2008, I do not want the patent to issue with the piston with check valve in independent claim to be shown in independent claim no. 45. I wish it to remain as I originally suggested as a dependent claim, currently claim No. 57 in my Fax to you of February 28, 2007. This check valve was an afterthought by me to prevent airlock and is not necessarily needed for the pump to operate thus making this patent application too easy to circumvent. The only place I know of that really has a problem with airlock is with straight centrifugal pumps. I have never seen a Piston Pump with a need for this feature. The feature was included just to cover the contingency that there might be airlock.

As far as conflict with the Anderson patent, Anderson shows a chain, which is a flexible connector, but Anderson's connector has to connect to a rigid piston shaft that passes through packing or an enclosed upper end as he is pumping on the upstroke. My connector connects directly to the weighted piston at one end and the buoy at the other. The wording in claim 45 as sent to you on the 28th is your wording, first sent to me by you on January 18, 2007 by email and formally included in the patent wrapper around January 30-31, 2007, and lists a flexible connector in your claim 45. All changes I made to claim 45 are shown by either the words being struck through if deleted or underlined if added. If you wish, I could

March 8, 2007

just say "connector" eliminating the word "flexible." That would make for an even tighter patent. I would also like to eliminate all references to a particular material being used for a connector claims

My patent application can stand on the weighted piston, enclosed bottom end of cylinder with an open top end of the cylinder as you so aptly defined because this is the crux of my invention and no other invention has these features. Therefore I wish to have the patent issued as I submitted to you in my Fax of February 28, 2007, including dependent claims 46-63 with only the points discussed in this fax being open for change. I have included dependent claims 54, flexible shaft and 55, rope, as you included dependent claim 46, chain and dependent claim 47 cable. I would much prefer to strike all of these claims, 46, 47, 54, and 55 and make no reference as to the material the flexible connector is made of.

I do not see the necessity of another drawing to illustrate a buoy large enough to be affected. All buoys will be so affected; the larger the buoy the more the affect by the tide is noticed. I am not trying to patent the idea of using a salvage oil tanker as a buoy, although it could be so used. I made this reference to give you an idea of when a buoy would be more affected by the tide than the waves.

If you are still of the mind that I cannot say "at least one intake and outlet check valve" and must say "an intake and outlet check valve", I guess I will have to file a "Continuation In Part."

Very truly yours,



Richard N. Hill, Jr.